



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/672,456	09/26/2003	Rami Caspi	2003P08210US	9701

7590 01/12/2006

Siemens Corporation
Attn: Elsa Keller, Legal Administrator
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

MARSH, OLIVIA MARIE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2686

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/672,456

Applicant(s)

CASPI ET AL.

Examiner

Olivia Marsh

Art Unit

2686

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 October 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1. ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2. ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3. ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/25/05
4. ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
5. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6. ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. However, referring to Applicant's statement "Murray is not able to set a boundary," the Examiner asserts the term 'boundary' does not inherently mean a geographic boundary. Murray discloses event criteria parameters 129 (column 6, lines 49-51) that may be received by the wireless communication device (column 20-23) which are compared with event information (column 10, lines 38-40) to determine if the wireless user has exceeded user set boundaries. The Examiner also contends Murray also discloses maintaining presence/availability information on the user within a predetermined range (please review below rejection of claim 6 and column 13, lines 8-12 of Murray reference).

2. Applicant's arguments filed 10/25/05, regarding claims 13-16, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As stated above, Applicant's statement "Murray is not able to set a boundary," the Examiner asserts the term 'boundary' does not inherently mean a geographic boundary. Murray discloses event criteria parameters 129 (column 6, lines 49-51) that may be received by the wireless communication device (column 20-23) which are compared with event information (column 10, lines 38-40) to determine if the wireless user has exceeded user set boundaries. The Examiner also contends Murray also discloses maintaining presence/availability information on the user within a predetermined range (please review below rejection of claim 6 and column 13, lines 8-12 of Murray reference).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-3, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Murray (U.S. 6,484,033 B2) in view of Greene (U.S. 2002/0077080 A1).**

As to claim 1, Murray discloses an invention related to wireless communication systems for schedule management through communication to one or more wireless communication devices (column 1, lines 7-10). Murray also discloses a wireless communication system 10, reading on claimed "telecommunication system," comprising a wireless communication device 32 which possesses a device management application 108, reading on claimed "positioning controller," that determines the current location 122 based on the plurality of signals 81 in the device memory 100 (column 8, lines 50-53) and a device processor 98 for processing received messages from the system (column 6, lines 5-7). Murray also discloses [column 13, lines 1-28]:

In Step 176, when the event date 137 matches the current date 135 or the process of FIG. 9 continues, the event time 132 and the event location 134 are monitored. In Step 178, the traffic data 171 (FIG. 3) is monitored. Next, in Step 180, the traffic data 171 is checked for a delay. In Step 182, when no traffic delay is detected, the travel time 173 is then calculated to determine how long it will take to get to the event location 134. In Step 184, the travel time 173 (see FIG. 4) is then compared to the alert setting 175 to check that the limit 177 has been reached, *reading on claimed "said user-defined boundary at*

Art Unit: 2686

an associated time and date." If the limit 177 has not been reached, the process returns to Step 176. The process continues to Step 186 when the limit has been reached, and the device event management application 108 sends the application response 118 to the device processor 98 to initiate an alert to the device user 68, *reading on claimed "positioning controller determines that said wireless devices is outside said user-defined boundary at an associated time and date."* The alert 103 is initiated by the device processor 98 sending a command to the alert circuit 102. After an alert has been initiated and sent, in Step 188, the current time 114 and current location 122 of the device is monitored. Next, in Step 190, the travel time 173 is again calculated. Next, in Step 192, the travel time 173 is compared to the alert setting 175 to check that the limit 177 has been reached. When the limit 177 has not been reached, the process returns to Step 188. The process continues to Step 194 when the limit 177 has been reached, and the device event management application 108 sends the application response 118 to the device processor 98 to initiate a call or send a message to the contact phone number 238 of FIG. 10 of a backup wireless device.

Murray also discloses the call or message can include the event information 120 which can be received and stored by the backup wireless communication device 47 (column 14, lines 34-37), *reading on claimed "an administrative device for receiving a user-defined boundary and time and date associations and receiving alerts from said wireless communication device via said communications controller when said positioning controller determines that said wireless device is outside said user-defined boundary at an associated time and date."*

However, Murray fails to disclose said administrative device further maintains availability information for a user of said wireless device within said user-defined boundary. The Examiner

Art Unit: 2686

contends this feature was old and well known in the art at the time of invention as taught by Greene.

In the same field of endeavor, Greene teaches a system for tracking the status and location of users of wireless devices and more particularly to a tracking system making use of the Internet and instant message (IM) technology (paragraph 1). Greene also teaches the wireless device converts the position data into to a location tag, and transmits the location tag to the IM server only when position changes enough to cause the location tag to change and the wireless device then translates the position data into location tags and transmits the status update message to the IM server, also reading on claimed "administrative device," only when position changes enough to cause the location tag to change (paragraph 12). Greene also teaches a first status update message can be transmitted when the wireless device is in the vicinity of the home location, whereas a different message is transmitted when the wireless device is not in the vicinity of the home location and the different message can vary with the distance of the wireless device from the home location (paragraph 13), reading on claimed "administrative device further maintains availability information for a user of said wireless within said user-defined boundary."

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to require a telecommunications system comprising a wireless device including a positioning controller and a communications controller; and an administrative device for receiving a user-defined boundary and time and date associations and receiving alerts from said wireless communication device via said communications controller when said positioning controller determines that said wireless device is outside said user-defined boundary at an associated time and date, as taught by Murray, said administrative device further maintains availability information for a user of said wireless device within said user-defined boundary, as

Art Unit: 2686

taught by Greene, in order to automatically update the status or location of an individual whenever it changes.

As to **claim 2**, Murray and Greene teach everything as applied in claim 1 and Murray further discloses the GPS receiver 79 receives signals 81 broadcasted from a GPS system 77 and the device processor 98 processes the received signals 81 to calculate the location of the wireless communication device 32 (column 8, lines 38-42) and the current location 122 can be determined from the processing of the plurality of signals 81 in the device memory 100 for later use by the device event management application 108 (column 8, lines 50-53), reading on claimed "said positioning controller receives global positioning network signals for determining a position of said wireless communications device."

As to **claim 3**, Murray and Greene teach everything as applied in claim 1 and Murray further discloses the wireless communication system 10 can function utilizing any wireless RF channel, including a mobile cellular telephone channel (column 4, lines 1-2) and the device processor 98 processes messages from the system (column 6, lines 5-7), reading on claimed "communications controller comprises a cellular network controller for transmitting on a cellular telephone network to said administrative device."

As to **claim 5**, Murray and Greene teach everything as applied in claim 1 and Murray further discloses the application server 76, also reading on claimed "administrative device," controls and manages communication of the update message 36 to the plurality of wireless communication devices 40 in response to location information and a multitude of unscheduled and scheduled events by sending wireless messages to the plurality of wireless communication devices 40 and the application server 76 manages an event schedule 80 of which the plurality of device users is reminded on a particular day or time, facilitating management of the group of device users through communication with the plurality wireless communication devices 40

Art Unit: 2686

(column 4, lines 63-67; column 5, lines 1-2), reading on claimed "said administrative device can receive requests to change said user-defined boundary and time and date associations and transmit said changes to said wireless telecommunications device."

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murray and Greene as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of well known prior art (MPEP 2144.03).

As to **claim 4**, Murray and Greene teach everything as applied in claim 1 and Murray further discloses the device event management application 108 sends the application response 118 to the device processor 98 to initiate a call or send a message to the contact phone number 238 of FIG. 10, which is the predetermined contact person for the event and this call or message notifies the contact person that the device user 68 will either be late for the event, reading on claimed "location information," or will not be able to make it (column 13, lines 25-31).

However, Murray and Greene fail to specifically disclose the administrative device is adapted to display location information when said wireless device is determined to be outside said predetermined range. The Examiner contends this feature was old and well known in the art at the time of invention as taught by well known prior art.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that it was old and well known in the art at the time of invention to display the content of messages received by a mobile device on the mobile device's display in inform the mobile user of the content of the message.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to require the telecommunication system and administrative device, disclosed by Murray, the administrative device is adapted to display location information when said wireless

Art Unit: 2686

device is determined to be outside said predetermined range, as taught by well known prior art, to display to the backup device contents of an alert sent to the backup device.

6. Claims 6-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murray (U.S. 6,484,033 B2) in view of well known prior art (MPEP 2144.03) and in further view of Greene (U.S. 2002/0077080 A1).

As to claim 6, Murray discloses an invention related to wireless communication systems for schedule management through communication to one or more wireless communication devices (column 1, lines 7-10). Murray also discloses the application server 76 communicates the event schedule 80 and any associated information, tasks, or changes by sending a server command 84 via the server interface 78 to the system controller 24 and upon receipt of the server command 84 from the application server 76, transmits the event schedule 80, task, or change to the plurality of wireless communication devices 40 (column 5, lines 24-31). Murray also discloses the event information 120 includes an event time 132, an event location 134, one or more event criteria parameters 129, and event backup information 136 (column 6, lines 35-37); and the event criteria parameters 129 can include, for example, a travel time 173, an alert setting 175, and a limit 177 which is a predetermined algorithm, a time of day for example, within the alert setting 175 (column 6, lines 49-55), reading on claimed "programming said wireless device to be in a predetermined range, said predetermined range comprising route, and daily routine limits." Murray also discloses the limit 177 has been reached, and the device event management application 108 sends the application response 118 to the device processor 98 to initiate a call or send a message to the contact phone number 238 of FIG. 10 of a backup wireless device (column 13, lines 24-28), reading on claimed "transmitting one or more alerting

Art Unit: 2686

signals to an administrative device when said wireless device is determined to be outside said predetermined range.”

Murray also discloses the travel time 173 is then compared to the alert setting 175 to check that the limit 177 has been reached. If the limit 177 has not been reached (column 13, lines 8-12), reading on claimed “maintaining presence and availability information on said predetermined user within said predetermined range.”

However, Murray fails to disclose the predetermined range comprising a geographic perimeter. The Examiner contends this feature was old and well known in the art at the time of invention as taught by Greene.

Greene also teaches associate the position data, parameters that describe the position space represented by each location tag are stored in the entity that performs the position-to-location-tag conversion, i.e., a wireless device 13, IM server 19 or a proxy server (paragraph 18). Greene also teaches a “home” location tag could be specified in terms of a geometric area such as the center and radius of a circle, the foci of an ellipse, or the width and length of a rectangle (paragraph 18), reading on claimed “predetermined range comprising a geographic perimeter.”

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to require a telecommunications method comprising the steps of affixing a wireless device to a predetermined user; programming said wireless device to be in a predetermined range, said predetermined range comprising route and daily routine limits; maintaining presence and availability information on said predetermined user within said predetermined range; and transmitting one or more alerting signals to an administrative device when said wireless device is determined to be outside said predetermined range, as taught by Murray, said predetermined

Art Unit: 2686

range comprising a geographic perimeter, as taught by Greene, in order to automatically update the status or location of the user whenever it changes.

Murray and Greene teach everything as stated above and Murray also discloses the wireless communication device 32 may be a two-way pager (column 4, lines 15-16). However, Murray and Greene fail to specifically disclose the two-way pager is affixed to a predetermined user. The Examiner contends this feature was old and well known in the art at the time of invention as taught by well known prior art.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that it was old and well known in the art at the time of invention to attach a wireless paging device to the user's belt loop or holder attached to the belt loop of the user.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to require the method and wireless device, taught by Murray and Greene, and affixing a wireless device to a predetermined user, as taught by well known prior art, to ensure the user will receive alerts and messages and soon as they arrive at the mobile device.

As to **claim 7**, Murray, Greene, and well known prior art teach everything as applied in claim 6 and Murray further discloses that the wireless communication device 32, the backup wireless communication device 47, and the second backup wireless communication device 42 in accordance with the present invention, can be a mobile cellular telephone, a mobile radio data terminal, a mobile cellular telephone having an attached data terminal, or a two way pager (column 4, lines 10-16), reading on claimed "administrative device comprises a telephony device."

As to **claim 8**, Murray, Greene, and well known prior art teach everything as applied in claim 6 and Murray further discloses the device processor 98 and the change notification

Art Unit: 2686

message 54 is sent to the wireless communication system 10 via the device transmitter 94; then the wireless communication system 10 transmits the change notification message 54 via the RF transmitter 26 to the backup wireless communication device 47 (column 15, lines 24-26) and the change notification message 54 can be a data message (column 3, line 62-63).

However, Murray and Greene fail to specifically teach the alert data message to the backup wireless device comprises one or more e-mail signals. The Examiner maintains this feature was old and well known in the art at the time of invention as taught by well known prior art.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that it was old and well known in the art at the time of invention to send email messages containing text between mobile devices in order to convey information between the mobile users.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to require the method and alert signals, taught by Murray and Greene, to be email signals, as taught by well known prior art, to enable the mobile user unable to attend a event to easily and efficiently provide a backup mobile user all of the pertinent information regarding such an event to enable the backup user to possibly attend the event.

As to claim 9, Murray, Greene and well known prior art teach everything as applied in claim 6 and Murray further discloses the device processor 98 and the change notification message 54 is sent to the wireless communication system 10 via the device transmitter 94; then the wireless communication system 10 transmits the change notification message 54 via the RF transmitter 26 to the backup wireless communication device 47 (column 15, lines 24-26) and the change notification message 54 can be a data message (column 3, line 62-63).

However, Murray and Greene fail to specifically teach the alert data message to the backup wireless device comprises one or more Instant Messaging signals. The Examiner

Art Unit: 2686

maintains this feature was old and well known in the art at the time of invention as taught by well known prior art.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that it was old and well known in the art at the time of invention to send Instant Messages between mobile devices in order to quickly convey information between the mobile users.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to require the method and alert signals, taught by Murray and Greene, to be Instant Messaging signals, as taught by well known prior art, to enable the mobile user unable to attend a event to quickly provide a backup mobile user all of the pertinent information regarding such an event to enable the backup user to possibly attend the event.

As to claim 10, Murray, Greene, and well known prior art teach everything as applied in claim 6 and Murray further discloses the application server 76, also reading on claimed "administrative device," controls and manages communication of the update message 36 to the plurality of wireless communication devices 40 in response to location information and a multitude of unscheduled and scheduled events by sending wireless messages to the plurality of wireless communication devices 40 and the application server 76 manages an event schedule 80 of which the plurality of device users is reminded on a particular day or time, facilitating management of the group of device users through communication with the plurality wireless communication devices 40 (column 4, lines 63-67; column 5, lines 1-2), reading on claimed "receiving at said administrative device one or more requests to alter said predetermined range."

As to claim 11, Murray, Greene, and well known prior art teach everything as applied in claim 6 and Murray discloses everything as applied in claim 10 and Murray further discloses the system controller 24 communicates a system request 86 to the application server 76 via the

Art Unit: 2686

server interface 78 for changes to the event schedule 80, responsibilities, the backup list 85, and other event features (column 5, lines 31-35) and the event criteria parameters 129 can include, for example, a travel time 173, an alert setting 175, and a limit 177 (column 6, lines 49-51), reading on claimed "receiving at said wireless communication device a temporary variance to said predetermined range."

As to **claim 12**, Murray, Greene, and well known prior art teach everything as applied in claim 6 and Murray discloses everything as applied in claims 10-11; and Murray further discloses the update message 36 can include the time of the upcoming scheduled event, the calculated distance from the event and the calculated time required to reach the event (column 10, lines 65-67), reading on claimed "temporary variance comprises one or more new geographic, route, or daily routine limits."

7. Claims 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murray (U.S. 6,484,033 B2) and in further view of well known prior art (MPEP 2144.03).

As to **claim 13**, Murray discloses an invention related to wireless communication systems for schedule management through communication to one or more wireless communication devices (column 1, lines 7-10). Murray also discloses a wireless communication system 10 comprising a wireless communication device 32, reading on claimed "wireless telecommunications device," which possesses a device management application 108, reading on claimed "positioning controller," that determines the current location 122 based on the plurality of signals 81 in the device memory 100 (column 8, lines 50-53), reading on claimed "said wireless telecommunications device including a positioning controller for determining a position of said wireless communication device," and a device processor 98 for processing

Art Unit: 2686

received messages from the system (column 6, lines 5-7). Murray also discloses [column 13, lines 1-28]:

In Step 176, when the event date 137 matches the current date 135 or the process of FIG. 9 continues, the event time 132 and the event location 134 are monitored. In Step 178, the traffic data 171 (FIG. 3) is monitored. Next, in Step 180, the traffic data 171 is checked for a delay. In Step 182, when no traffic delay is detected, the travel time 173 is then calculated to determine how long it will take to get to the event location 134. In Step 184, the travel time 173 (see FIG. 4) is then compared to the alert setting 175 to check that the limit 177 has been reached, *reading on claimed "predetermined routine."* If the limit 177 has not been reached, the process returns to Step 176. The process continues to Step 186 when the limit has been reached, and the device event management application 108 sends the application response 118 to the device processor 98 to initiate an alert to the device user 68. The alert 103 is initiated by the device processor 98 sending a command to the alert circuit 102. After an alert has been initiated and sent, in Step 188, the current time 114 and current location 122 of the device is monitored, *reading on claimed "monitoring said predetermined user's actual routine."* Next, in Step 190, the travel time 173 is again calculated. Next, in Step 192, the travel time 173 is compared to the alert setting 175 to check that the limit 177 has been reached. When the limit 177 has not been reached, the process returns to Step 188. The process continues to Step 194 when the limit 177 has been reached, and the device event management application 108 sends the application response 118 to the device processor 98 to initiate a call or send a message to the contact phone number 238 of FIG. 10 of a backup wireless device, *reading on claimed "a communications controller for transmitting a position of said wireless telecommunications device to an*

administrative device and sending one or more alert signals to said administrative device if said actual routine differs from a programmed predetermined routine."

Murray also discloses the wireless communication device 32 is assigned for use in the wireless communication system 10 has an address 60 or identity assigned thereto which is a unique selective call address in the wireless communication system 10 (column 4, lines 21-24), reading on claimed "associating a predetermined user with a wireless telecommunications device." Murray also discloses the event schedule 80, received from the application server 76 of the wireless communication system 20 identifies the device user 68 and the wireless communication device for a particular event (column 7, lines 53-56), reading on claimed "programming said wireless telecommunications device to said predetermined user's daily routine." Murray also discloses the event criteria parameters 129 can include a travel time 173, an alert setting 175, a limit 177, and an alert 103; the travel time 173 can be a length of time in minutes; the alert setting 175 can be a combination of the limit 177 and the alert 103; the limit 177 is a predetermined algorithm, for example, a time of day (column 8, lines 61-67), reading on claimed "said daily routine including boundary and time associations."

Murray also discloses the travel time 173 is then compared to the alert setting 175 to check that the limit 177 has been reached. If the limit 177 has not been reached (column 13, lines 8-12), reading on claimed "maintaining presence and availability information on said predetermined user within said predetermined user's daily routine."

Murray discloses everything as stated above and Murray also discloses the wireless communication device 32 may be a two-way pager (column 4, lines 15-16). However, Murray fails to specifically disclose the two-way pager is affixed to a predetermined user. The Examiner contends this feature was old and well known in the art at the time of invention as taught by well known prior art.

Art Unit: 2686

The Examiner takes Official Notice that it was old and well known in the art at the time of invention to attach a wireless paging device to the user's belt loop or holder attached to the belt loop of the user.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to require the method and wireless device, disclosed by Murray, and affixing a wireless device to a predetermined user, as taught by well known prior art, to ensure the user will receive alerts and messages and soon as they arrive at the mobile device.

As to claim 14, Murray and well known prior art teach everything as applied in claim 13 and Murray further discloses the application server 76, also reading on claimed "administrative device," controls and manages communication of the update message 36 to the plurality of wireless communication devices 40 in response to location information and a multitude of unscheduled and scheduled events by sending wireless messages to the plurality of wireless communication devices 40 and the application server 76 manages an event schedule 80 of which the plurality of device users is reminded on a particular day or time, facilitating management of the group of device users through communication with the plurality wireless communication devices 40 (column 4, lines 63-67; column 5, lines 1-2), reading on claimed "receiving at said administrative device for a variation in said predetermined range."

As to claim 15, Murray and well known prior art teach everything as applied in claim 13 and Murray discloses everything as applied in claim 14 and Murray further discloses the system controller 24 communicates a system request 86 to the application server 76 via the server interface 78 for changes to the event schedule 80, responsibilities, the backup list 85, and other event features (column 5, lines 31-35) and the event criteria parameters 129 can include, for example, a travel time 173, an alert setting 175, and a limit 177 (column 6, lines 49-51), reading

Art Unit: 2686

on claimed "transmitting a variance to said wireless telecommunication device from said administrative device."

As to claim 16, Murray and well known prior art teach everything as applied in claim 13 and Murray discloses everything as applied in claims 14-15 and Murray further discloses the wireless communication system 10 can function utilizing any wireless RF channel, including a mobile cellular telephone channel (column 4, lines 1-2) and the device processor 98 processes messages from the system (column 6, lines 5-7), reading on claimed "transmitting variance comprises transmitting via a cellular telephone network."

Art Unit: 2686

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olivia Marsh whose telephone number is 571-272-7912. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold can be reached on 571-272-7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Marsha D Banks-Harold
MARSHA D. BANKS-HAROLD
SUPERVISOR, PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600